

### REMARKS

Claims 3, 10, and 12 have been amended to remove multiple dependencies. The specification including the Abstract and claim 1 have been amended to remove an obvious typographical error; thus, the second occurring  $R_3$  has been replaced with  $R_3'$ . This is supported by the entire disclosure of the application as would be understood by those skilled in the art. New claims 17-42 have been added which were originally part of the multiple dependent claims. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

As an initial observation, the PCT Written Opinion states "claim 8 appears to be identical to claim 6". Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 6 recites compounds of formula III, which are beta-anomers and claim 8 recites compounds of formula IV, which are alpha-anomers. Thus, claims 6 and 8 are different.

A favorable decision is solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Xavier Pillai, Reg. No. 39,799  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: April 7, 2005